

1 **SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS**

2 **Data source and survey questionnaire**

3 Data for the study were from the Indian District Level Household and facility Survey (DLHS) cross-
4 sectional surveys which are publicly available upon request from the Director of the Indian
5 Institute of Population Sciences (IIPS), Mumbai [1]. The DLHS surveys have been designed and
6 conducted by the IIPS, under supervision of the Ministry of Health, Government of India. The DLHS
7 surveys were designed to periodically monitor and assess reproductive and child health program
8 indicators to reduce infant and maternal mortality through the promotion of newborn care,
9 immunization, antenatal care and institutional delivery in every district of India. Four rounds of the
10 DLHS were completed until the time of this analysis (DLHS-1 in 1998–99, DLHS-2 in 2002–04, DLHS-
11 3 in 2007–08 & DLHS-4 in 2012-13). Data from DLHS-4 were not included in this analysis as the
12 surveys covered only 336 of 640 Indian districts (21 Indian States and Union Territories) and was
13 therefore not representative nationally. On average, the interval between each of the DLHS
14 surveys was 4-5 years. Each DLHS round employed a similar systematic, multi-stage stratified
15 sampling design (see below). The first round of DLHS (DLHS-1) covered a sample of 474,463
16 currently married women aged 15–44 years, DLHS-2 covered 507,622 currently married women
17 aged 15–44 years and DLHS-3 covered 643,944 ever married women aged 15–49 years [2–5].

18 The DLHS used two survey tools to capture information from eligible households (Household
19 questionnaire) and eligible women in the reproductive age group (Women’s questionnaire). The
20 questionnaires were interviewer-administered and all the questionnaires were bilingual – with
21 questions in both regional and English language. The questionnaires were designed by the IIPS in
22 consultation with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and the World Bank, and pre-tested in
23 one Indian State and in each of the different languages by regional agencies. For this study, we

24 only used pre-existing information from the DLHS “Women’s questionnaire”, covering the
25 following major themes: socio-demographic characteristics such as age, place of birth, educational
26 attainment, number of births, also including accounts of antenatal care and pregnancy related
27 complications and post-partum care. For recent births, immunization status of children was
28 collected from the vaccination card or by asking the mothers to recall the vaccination status of
29 their youngest children. A formal comparison of all the large-scale, national, population-based
30 surveys including the DLHS surveys covering differences in the types of respondents, key
31 questionnaire themes - including proportions of questions covering important maternal,
32 reproductive and child health indicators, along with time frame of availability of data and
33 analytical publications resulting from the DLHS datasets is available elsewhere [6]. In summary,
34 the type and number of questions providing information on household, maternal and child
35 characteristics and immunization histories were generally similar for the DLHS surveys, however,
36 an increase in the number of questions about child and maternal health and non-communicable
37 diseases has been reported from DLHS-1 to DLHS-4 [6].

38

39 **Survey design and weight calculations**

40 Each of the DLHS surveys used a multi-stage, stratified, systematic sampling design. In each
41 district, up to 50 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs), representing census villages in rural areas and
42 wards in urban areas were selected as the first stage using Probability Proportional to Size (PPS)
43 sampling. The 1991 Census list of India was used as the sampling frames for DLHS-1 and DLHS-2
44 and 2001 Census list served as the sampling frame for the DLHS-3. All the villages and urban wards
45 in a district were stratified by total number of households in the PSU, female literacy and
46 percentage of Scheduled caste/Scheduled tribe population (only in DLHS-3). The target sample in

47 each district was set to cover a minimum of 1,000 residential households from the selected PSUs.
48 The selection of households in a PSU was done after listing all the households in the PSUs and
49 using either circular systematic random sampling thereafter. This involved mapping and listing of
50 structures and households for each sampled PSU, following which segmentation of smaller areas
51 within villages or wards was carried out systematically and households were selected for sampling
52 from selected segments using PPS sampling. In addition, 10% oversampling of households was
53 done to account for non-response.

54 District-level sampling weights for households and currently-married (DLHS-1 & DLHS-2) or ever-
55 married women (DLHS-3) were calculated using the selection probabilities at each stage of
56 randomization, i.e. 1) the probability of selection of PSU in a district, 2) the probability of selecting
57 segment from segmented PSU and 3) the probability of selecting households from the total list of
58 households in a PSU or segments of a PSU. State-level weights for households and women were
59 derived as weighted averages of the corresponding district-level weights. Similarly, national-level
60 weights were computed by proportionalization using the all India sample and census totals by
61 states and rural-urban residence. The weighting scheme followed for the DLHS surveys was
62 comparable and additional information on the probability calculations at each level of
63 randomization and for the state and national-level weights are found elsewhere [3,4].

64

65 **Variables**

66 **Outcome**

67 We combined data recorded from children's vaccination card and maternal recall into a three-
68 level categorical variable capturing if children were fully-vaccinated, partially-vaccinated or
69 unvaccinated by 12 months of age using World Health Organization recommendations. Previous

70 reports have highlighted potential differences in the predictors and reasons for partial-vaccination
71 and non-vaccination among young children [7,8]. A recent study using data from the DLHS-3
72 survey reported that the predictors of partial- and non-vaccination were generally similar [9],
73 however our study intended to examine the factors associated with suboptimal vaccination uptake
74 across three consecutive DLHS surveys conducted from 1998 to 2008. We hypothesized that any
75 differences in the factors associated with suboptimal childhood vaccination would be more
76 pronounced when combining information for the three DLHS surveys. Also, to investigate potential
77 differences in the factors associated with the vaccination status of “partially-vaccinated” children
78 based on whether the children had very few vaccines or nearly all, but were missing only one or
79 two, we recategorized these children as those who received 1) “very few” recommended doses (1
80 – 2 doses), 2) “some” recommended doses (3 – 5 doses) or 3) “almost all” recommended doses (6
81 – 7 doses).

82

83 **Selection of socio-demographic variables**

84 The primary analysis of the study aimed to examine socio-demographic disparities in children’s
85 vaccination status, as social determinants are known to have a significant impact on routine
86 immunization programs in countries regardless of their income level [10]. Research using
87 demographic and health survey (DHS) data worldwide tend to focus on examining socio-
88 demographic disparities for different human health indicators [11]. Socio-demographic variables
89 are also important indicators of inequalities in access to or uptake of immunization and other
90 health services among different populations [8,10]. We used individual, household and regional
91 variables known to have a well-documented association with children’s vaccination status in India.
92 Of the individual variables, child-specific variables such as gender and age of the child in months

93 were selected for the analysis. Gender disparities in children’s vaccination status in India have
94 been reported for decades now, with a recent study reporting regional, religious and other socio-
95 economic factors that compound this disparity [11–13]. Further, maternal characteristics such as
96 mother’s age at childbirth, educational attainment, antenatal participation, place of delivery and
97 maternal tetanus vaccination were selected for analysis. Children of adolescent mothers (aged 15
98 – 19 years) are known to be more likely to be partially vaccinated and unvaccinated in India and
99 elsewhere [14,15]. Also, while the association between higher maternal education and complete
100 vaccination has been extensively reported, it is important to examine the influence of lower
101 educational attainment (primary or lesser schooling) on childhood vaccination status [12,16].
102 Traditionally, antenatal participation has represented mother’s access to and regular use of
103 government health care services and an increasing number antenatal visits are known to be
104 associated with a higher probability of complete childhood vaccination [17]. Place of delivery,
105 specifically home deliveries are known to be associated with lower full immunization coverage in
106 India, and a recent analysis of the DLHS-3 data found increased odds of non-vaccination among
107 children born in private institutions, we therefore considered place of delivery as an important
108 factor determining vaccination coverage. In addition, social group and religious preference were
109 selected as they may represent potential disparities in access to health services and are also
110 known to represent parental beliefs and attitudes toward healthcare and vaccination decisions
111 [9,18]. To adjust for household wealth, we used the type of dwelling as a proxy measure,
112 categorized as “cemented” construction, “thatched” construction or a “mix” of cement and thatch
113 construction. Type of dwelling was used more as an “absolute” measure of household wealth to
114 help quantify the level of poverty of survey households as opposed to “wealth indices”, which are
115 relative measures of wealth generally created using Demographic and Health Survey data [19]. As

116 regional variables, we adjusted for urban and rural location of residence and used a categorization
117 like one previously used for India to account for wider geographic region of residence [20].

118 **Statistical analyses**

119 To account for the complex DLHS survey design, we set the pooled datasets using the “svyset” set
120 of commands in STATA 12. For survey setting the data, we used the “psu” or primary sampling unit
121 along with the supplied national-level weights provided as part of the DLHS datasets. The use of
122 these weights enabled calculation of unbiased population-level estimates of vaccination coverage
123 for children aged 12-23 months and for the regression estimates. Univariate regression modelling
124 was performed for each of the socio-demographic variables to examine their association with
125 children’s vaccination status. Since the outcome of children’s vaccination status had three levels,
126 multinomial logistic regression was used to examine associations between the socio-demographic
127 variables and the odds of partial-vaccination and non-vaccination versus full-vaccination among
128 children aged 12-23 months. We used the Wald test p-values, which tests associations across all
129 categories of the exposure and outcome variables as likelihood-ratio tests are not recommended
130 for survey data where individual observations are no longer independent. All the socio-
131 demographic variables were significantly associated with children’s vaccination status at $p \leq 0.05$
132 level and were included in the multivariate regression model. The multivariate model adjusted for
133 age of the child in months, type of dwelling and geographical region. The importance of each
134 socio-demographic variable in the multivariate model (or model fit) was assessed using the Wald
135 test statistic p-values derived using the “mlogtest”, post-estimation command in STATA 12. All
136 categories of the socio-demographic variables were significantly associated at the $p \leq 0.05$ level
137 across the different levels of the outcome. For the secondary analyses, we categorized the
138 partially vaccinated children to explore differences in the factors associated with vaccination

139 status based on whether children received “very few” vaccines (1 – 2 doses), “some” vaccines (3 –
140 5 doses) or “almost all” vaccines (6 – 7 doses). We used multinomial logistic regression, to handle
141 the three-level outcome, examining the factors associated with having “very few” or “some” of
142 the recommended vaccines compared to having “almost all” vaccines by 12 months of age. We
143 repeated the modeling strategy and adjustment for confounding used in the primary analysis and
144 the results of the secondary analysis is presented in Supplementary Table 2.

145

146 **References**

- 147 [1] International Institute for Population Sciences n.d. <http://iipsindia.org/> (accessed June 5,
148 2017).
- 149 [2] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS). Reproductive and Child Health Project,
150 Rapid Household Survey (Phase I and II) 1998 - 1999: India 2001.
- 151 [3] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS). District Level Household and Facility
152 Survey (DLHS - 2), 2002 - 2004: India 2006.
- 153 [4] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS). District Level Household and Facility
154 Survey (DLHS - 3), 2007 - 2008: India 2010.
- 155 [5] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS). District Level Household and Facility
156 Survey (DLHS - 4), 2012 - 2013: India 2014.
- 157 [6] Dandona R, Pandey A, Dandona L. A review of national health surveys in India. *Bull World*
158 *Health Organ* 2016;94:286–296A. doi:10.2471/BLT.15.158493.
- 159 [7] Favin M, Steinglass R, Fields R, Banerjee K, Sawhney M. Why children are not vaccinated: a
160 review of the grey literature. *Int Health* 2012;4:229–38. doi:10.1016/j.inhe.2012.07.004.
- 161 [8] Rainey JJ, Watkins M, Ryman TK, Sandhu P, Bo A, Banerjee K. Reasons related to non-
162 vaccination and under-vaccination of children in low and middle income countries: Findings
163 from a systematic review of the published literature, 1999–2009. *Vaccine* 2011;29:8215–21.
164 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.08.096.
- 165 [9] Shrivastwa N, Gillespie BW, Kolenic GE, Lepkowski JM, Boulton ML. Predictors of Vaccination
166 in India for Children Aged 12–36 Months. *Am J Prev Med* 2015;49:S435–44.
167 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.05.008.
- 168 [10] Glatman-Freedman A, Nichols K. The effect of social determinants on immunization
169 programs. *Hum Vaccines Immunother* 2012;8:293–301. doi:10.4161/hv.19003.
- 170 [11] Corsi DJ, Neuman M, Finlay JE, Subramanian SV. Demographic and health surveys: a
171 profile. *Int J Epidemiol* 2012;dys184. doi:10.1093/ije/dys184.
- 172 [12] Mathew JL. Inequity in childhood immunization in India: A systematic review. *Indian*
173 *Pediatr* 2012;49:203–23. doi:10.1007/s13312-012-0063-z.
- 174 [13] Kumar C, Singh PK, Singh L, Rai RK. Socioeconomic disparities in coverage of full
175 immunisation among children of adolescent mothers in India, 1990–2006: a repeated cross-
176 sectional analysis. *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e009768. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009768.

- 177 [14] Lassi ZS, Salam RA, Das JK, Wazny K, Bhutta ZA. An unfinished agenda on adolescent
178 health: Opportunities for interventions. *Semin Perinatol* 2015;39:353–60.
179 doi:10.1053/j.semperi.2015.06.005.
- 180 [15] Singh L, Rai RK, Singh PK. Assessing the utilization of maternal and child health care
181 among married adolescent women: evidence from India. *J Biosoc Sci* 2012;44:1–26.
182 doi:10.1017/S0021932011000472.
- 183 [16] Johri M, Subramanian SV, Sylvestre M-P, Dudeja S, Chandra D, Koné GK, et al.
184 Association between maternal health literacy and child vaccination in India: a cross-sectional
185 study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2015;69:849–57. doi:10.1136/jech-2014-205436.
- 186 [17] Dixit P, Dwivedi LK, Ram F. Strategies to Improve Child Immunization via Antenatal
187 Care Visits in India: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8:e66175.
188 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066175.
- 189 [18] Pande RP, Yazbeck AS. What’s in a country average? Wealth, gender, and regional
190 inequalities in immunization in India. *Soc Sci Med* 1982 2003;57:2075–88.
- 191 [19] Howe LD, Galobardes B, Matijasevich A, Gordon D, Johnston D, Onwujekwe O, et al.
192 Measuring socio-economic position for epidemiological studies in low- and middle-income
193 countries: a methods of measurement in epidemiology paper. *Int J Epidemiol* 2012;41:871–86.
194 doi:10.1093/ije/dys037.
- 195 [20] Singh PK. Trends in Child Immunization across Geographical Regions in India: Focus
196 on Urban-Rural and Gender Differentials. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8:e73102.
197 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0073102.
- 198
- 199
- 200
- 201